

REMARKS

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 13, and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bolosky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,804) in view of Staveley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,973,491); rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bolosky et al. in view of Staveley et al. and Frey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,725,392); and rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bolosky et al. in view of Staveley et al. and Jacobs et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0023898).

By this Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 2, 17, and 18 without prejudice or disclaimer. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's previous rejections, but solely to expedite prosecution, Applicants amend claims 1, 3-6, 10, 11, 13, 15, and 16 to improve form. Applicants also add new claims 19-33. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendment. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in paragraphs 0041-0052 of Applicants' application, as originally filed. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 with regard to the claims presented herein. Claims 1, 3-11, 13, 15, 16, and 19-33 are pending.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON BOLOSKY ET AL. AND STAVELEY ET AL.

In paragraph 4 of the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected pending claims 1, 3-7, 13, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bolosky et al. in view of Staveley et al. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1, for example, is directed to a file system that comprises a plurality of servers configured to store file data as chunks; and a master connected to the servers

and configured to store namespace data that includes file identifiers for files for which the file data is stored as chunks, store mapping data that maps the file identifiers to the chunks to which the file identifiers correspond, store an operation log that includes a record of changes to at least one of the namespace data or the mapping data, and store location data that identifies which of the servers stores which of the chunks, where the master is configured to communicate with the servers upon startup of the master to identify the chunks stored by the servers, and record, in a non-persistent manner, information regarding the chunks stored by each of the servers as the location data.

Neither Bolosky et al. nor Staveley et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in amended claim 1. For example, Bolosky et al. and Staveley et al. do not disclose or suggest a master that is configured to, among other things, store an operation log that includes a record of changes to at least one of namespace data, which includes file identifiers for files for which the file data is stored as chunks, or mapping data, which maps the file identifiers to the chunks to which the file identifiers correspond.

Bolosky et al. discloses creating a log of data block movements (col. 7, lines 33-35). Bolosky et al. does not disclose or suggest, however, that this log stores changes to at least one of namespace data (that includes file identifiers for files for which the file data is stored as chunks), or mapping data (that maps the file identifiers to the chunks to which the file identifiers correspond), as required by claim 1.

Staveley et al. discloses an Install Date application that retrieves the installation date and OS update date from the system and logs the beginning log date, the finish log date, and the

upgrade log date (col. 6, lines 64-67). Staveley et al. does not disclose or suggest, however, that this log stores changes to at least one of namespace data (that includes file identifiers for files for which the file data is stored as chunks), or mapping data (that maps the file identifiers to the chunks to which the file identifiers correspond), as required by claim 1.

For at least these reasons and the reasons presented in the after final request for reconsideration, filed June 28, 2007, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Bolosky et al. and Staveley et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Claims 3-7 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable over Bolosky et al. and Staveley et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Amended independent claims 13, 15, and 16 recite features similar to, yet possibly different in scope from, features recited in claim 1. Claims 13, 15, and 16 are, therefore, patentable over Bolosky et al. and Staveley et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2-7, 13, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Bolosky et al. and Staveley et al.

*REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON
BOLOSKY ET AL., STAVELEY ET AL., AND FREY ET AL.*

In paragraph 5 of the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bolosky et al. in view of Staveley et al. and Frey et al. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection

with regard to claims 8 and 9, Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of Frey et al. does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosures of Bolosky et al. and Staveley et al. identified above with regard to claim 1. For example, Frey et al. discloses prior art techniques for logging actions performed on a RAID system, logging changes between versions of a page, and logging transactions on a parity disk (col. 2, line 25 - col. 4, line 24). Frey et al. does not disclose or suggest, however, that any of these logs stores changes to at least one of namespace data (that includes file identifiers for files for which the file data is stored as chunks), or mapping data (that maps the file identifiers to the chunks to which the file identifiers correspond), as required by claim 1.

Therefore, claims 8 and 9 are patentable over Bolosky et al., Staveley et al., and Frey et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Bolosky et al., Staveley et al., and Frey et al.

***REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON
BOLOSKY ET AL., STAVELEY ET AL., AND JACOBS ET AL.***

In paragraph 6 of the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bolosky et al. in view of Staveley et al. and Jacobs et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection with regard to claims 10 and 11, Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of Jacobs et

al. does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosures of Bolosky et al. and Staveley et al. identified above with regard to claim 1. For example, Jacobs et al. does not disclose logging. Therefore, Jacobs et al. cannot disclose suggest a master that is configured to, among other things, store an operation log that includes a record of changes to at least one of namespace data, which includes file identifiers for files for which the file data is stored as chunks, or mapping data, which maps the file identifiers to the chunks to which the file identifiers correspond, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, claims 10 and 11 are patentable over Bolosky et al., Staveley et al., and Jacobs et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Bolosky et al., Staveley et al., and Jacobs et al.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 19-26 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

New claims 27-29 depend from claim 13 and are, therefore, patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 13.

New independent claim 30 recites features similar to, yet possibly different in scope from, features recited in claim 1. Claim 30 is, therefore, patentable over the applied references for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 1. Claims 31-33 depend from claim 30 and are, therefore, patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 30.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of pending claims 1, 3-11, 13, 15, 16, and 19-33.

As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to certain assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions regarding dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute these assertions/requirements in the future.

If the Examiner does not believe that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, LLP

By: /Paul A. Harrity, Reg. No. 39,574/

Paul A. Harrity

Reg. No. 39,574

Date: August 2, 2007
11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800